



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,867	10/14/2003	Horst Haussecker	21058/1206449-US1	6650
7278	7590	11/19/2007	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			LE, BRIAN Q	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2624		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		11/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/685,867	HAUSSECKER ET AL.
	Examiner Brian Q. Le	Art Unit 2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,12,13,24-26 and 28-30 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 4-6,12-13,24-26, and 28-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**Response to Amendment and Arguments**

1. Applicant's amendment filed September 24, 2007, has been entered and made of record.
2. Applicant's arguments with regard to claims 1-2, 4-6, 12-13, 24-26 and 28-30 have been fully considered, but are not considered persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding independent claims 1 and 24, the Applicant argues (pages 7-8 of the Remarks) that both Kley and Kondo do not disclose "aligning a biomolecule in a parallel manner on a surface by molecular combing; ... wherein the molecular combing comprises attachment of the biomolecules to the surface and alignment of the biomolecules". The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Due to broadly claimed limitations, the Examiner has reasonably interpreted the claim's language as follow (also indicated in the previous Office Action):

Aligning (arrange) a biomolecule in a parallel manner (arrange DNA in parallel manner) (Kondo, abstract, second paragraph; page 3, column 1, [0026]); and page 4, column 1, [0042]) on a surface (to a stationary-phase DNA probe) (Kondo, abstract, second paragraph) by molecular combing (by different kinds of DNA structure) (Kondo, page 3, column 1, [0026]); ... wherein the molecular combing (DNA structures) (Kondo, page 3, column 1, [0026]) comprises attachment of the biomolecules to the surface ("...spirally wound around the outer peripheral surface...") (page 5, column 1, [0060]) and alignment of the biomolecules (arrangement/forming DNA) (Kondo, page 3, column 1, [0026]).

The Examiner firmly believed that the interpretation for the claim's language above is reasonable due to broadly claimed language. To further assist the Applicant with the guidance with claim language interpretations so that the Applicant can add further/more details limitations from the specification to the claims to overcome the prior arts, the Examiner is presenting

Art Unit: 2624

MPEP, section 2111, Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation as follow: "The court explained that "reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from reading limitations of the specification into a claim,' to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim." The court found that applicant was advocating the latter, i.e., the impermissible importation of subject matter from the specification into the claim.). See also In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The court held that the PTO is not required, in the course of prosecution, to interpret claims in applications in the same manner as a court would interpret claims in an infringement suit. Rather, the "PTO applies to verbiage of the proposed claims the broadest reasonable meaning of the words in their ordinary usage as they would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into account whatever enlightenment by way of definitions or otherwise that may be afforded by the written description contained in applicant's specification.")".

For other arguments, please refer back to discussions above since they are depending on the basis of the arguments above. The Examiner believes that all the arguments of the Applicant have been properly addressed and explained. Thus, the rejections of all of the claims are maintained.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2624

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 12-13, 24-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kley U.S. Patent No. 6,396,054 and Kondo et al. U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0076996.

Regarding claim 1, Kley teaches a method comprising:

- a) alignment an object on a surface by molecular combing (column 16, lines 50-60 where object is positioning on the x,y plane (aligning object) on a surface (diamond coated surface) (column 16, lines 15-20) by molecular combing (column 17));
- b) imaging the object by at least two different modalities (different modes) of scanning probe microscopy (SPM) (column 2, lines 24-28) to obtain data for one or more properties of the object (metric measurements) (column 2, lines 50-51);
- c) analyzing the data using a model-based analysis using one or more models of physical structures of known objects (topography) (column 4, lines 63-67);
- c) estimating the values of one or more parameters from the data analysis (AFM and STM measurements) (column 10, lines 15-16); and
- d) fusing the estimated parameters to form one ore more fused parameters comprising a parameter-based characterization of the object (column 19, lines 20-50).

However, Kley does not explicitly disclose wherein an object can be a biomolecule and aligning a biomolecule in a parallel manner on a surface. Kondo teaches a method wherein an object can be a biomolecule (biological sample/DNA) (abstract, second paragraph); aligning a biomolecule in a parallel manner on a surface (abstract, second paragraph; page 3, column 1,

[0026]; and page 4, column 1, [0042]) and wherein the molecular combing comprises attachment of the biomolecule to a surface (connections with peripheral surface) (page 5, column 1, [0058-0059]) and alignment of the attached biomolecule (abstract, second paragraph; page 3, column 1, [0026]; and page 4, column 1, [0042]). Modifying Kley according to Kondo would be able to align biomolecule in parallel so that the detection of biomolecule (DNA) can be conducted rapidly and with precision (page 3, column 1, [0026]). This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Kley according to Kondo.

For claim 2, Kley teaches the method of claim 1, wherein parameter fusion is based on the model of the physical structure (gathering data/producing data) (column 19, lines 20-50).

Regarding claim 4, as disclosed in claim 1, Kondo also teaches the method further comprising identifying the biomolecule (detection of DNA) (page 1, column 1, [0001]).

For claim 5, as disclosed in claim 1, Kley discloses the method further comprising comparing the fused parameters with parameters determined from known biomolecule (as disclosed in claim 1) to identify an occurrence of a known biomolecule (topography)(column 4, lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 6, Kley (as discussed in claim 1) teaches the SPM imaging includes at least two modalities selected from the group consisting of scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) (column 2, lines 24-37).

For claim 12, as disclosed in claim 1, Kley also teaches the method further comprising known biomolecule structures to obtain ranges of parameters for each type of biomolecule (column 13, lines 60-67).

Regarding claim 13, as disclosed in claim 1, Kley further teaches the method wherein the parameter ranges for known biomolecules are used in estimating the parameters (column 14, lines 25-32).

For claim 24, please refer back to claim 1 for teachings and explanations. In addition, Kley further teaches controller (FIG. 26, “controller”, element 114) to control the operation of the scanning probe microscope, memory (FIG. 26, “memory”, element 124) to include one or more characterizations of known structures, and a surface for attachment (column 16, lines 15-20).

For claim 25, please refer back claim 5 for the teachings and explanations.

Regarding claim 26, Kley discloses the system wherein the characterizations of known structures are used to analyze a set of SPM images (column 4, lines 63-67 through column 5, 5-16).

For claim 28, please refer back to claim 5 for the teachings and explanations.

For claim 29, please refer to claim 1 for teachings and explanations. In addition, Kley further teaches step of analyzing images and reanalyzing the data (column 4, lines 63-67; column 7, lines 5-10; column 11, lines 60-67).

For claim 30, please refer back to claim 6 for further teachings and explanations.

5. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kley U.S. Patent No. 6,396,054 and Kondo et al. U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0076996, as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Grand et al. “Epitaxial growth of copper phthalocyanine monolayers on Ag(111)”, Surface Science, vol. 366, no. 3, 1 November 1996.

Regarding claim 8, Kley does not explicitly teach the method wherein the parameters are estimated by level set techniques, PDE (partial differential equation) techniques. Grand teaches the method wherein the parameters are estimated by level set techniques, PDE (partial differential equation) techniques (page 404, column 1, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph). Modifying Kley's method of utilizing scanning probe microscopy according to Grand would able to use partial differential equation as an estimation tool in estimating parameters. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Kley according to Grand.

For claim 9, Grand also teaches a method further comprising embedding the techniques in a probabilistic estimation framework (Page 405, column 1, last 15 lines and page 406, column 1, 1<sup>st</sup> 15 lines).

Regarding claim 10, Grand teaches the method further comprising classifying the subject by applying vector quantization, support vector machines (FIG. 7). Modifying Kley's method of utilizing scanning probe microscopy according to Grand would able to further classify fused parameter. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Kley according to Grand.

Referring claim 11, Grand teaches the method further comprising using known biomolecule structures to generate training sets of data (page 405, 1<sup>st</sup> column, last 10 lines).

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2624

**Contact Information**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Q. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-7424. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M - 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Brian Le  
Primary Examiner  
November 13, 2007